

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One (1) attached sheet of drawings include changes to Fig. 7(a) and 7(b). The changes to these Figures are as follows.

Sheet 1 includes Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) – Please add the legend -- PRIOR ART --;

Attachment: One (1) Replacement sheet

REMARKS

This Amendment is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated August 26, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Priority Acknowledgement

It is noted with appreciation that the Action acknowledged the claim for priority and the submission of certified copies of documents supporting that claim.

Specification

The specification has been reviewed and amendments have been made to the specification to correct minor matters of form as requested by the Examiner. In addition, “gentle-slope upheaval” when used to describe the boss part such as at page 17, is changed to refer, in addition to a “gently bulging-out” shape to alternative supporting language as “or protruded or raised”. Similar language is used to describe, for the limitation of claim 4, that the outer surface side circumferential area of said coupler pin hole of said external link is formed into a “raised” rather than a bulged-out shape. These changes collectively are believed to respond to the points of the examiner, but if any additional consideration is needed, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt consideration.

Drawings

The drawings have been amended as requested by the Examiner. Specifically, the Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) have been labeled as “PRIOR ART”.

Information Disclosure Statement

It is also acknowledged with appreciation that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 5, 2003 has been considered by the Examiner to the limited extent noted in section 10 spanning pages 4 and 5 of the Action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the reasons elaborated upon in the accompanying paper Supplemental Explanation re Information Disclosure Statement. Consideration of pages 1 to 5 of the specification as filed together with that Supplemental Explanation provide sufficient support for consideration of the cited art and to make it of record for the examination, at least as to the English language information carefully provided as there explained.

Claims

The specification has been amended to support the language used in claims 1, 2 and 8. It is considered that with the amendment to claim 1, the use of the term "raised" in each instance should be sufficient; however, if issues remain, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

As to the thickness of the bushing hole inquiry as to claim 5, please refer to page 7, second paragraph where it recites "Furthermore, it is advisable that the bushing hole part of the internal like is 1.1 to 2.0 times greater in thickness dimension than the coupler pin hole part of the external link." It is not believed to be necessary to repeat this language in the Best Mode part of the text, but if the examiner would prefer, that change can be supplemented.

Claims

Original claims 1 to 7 were rejected as indefinite.

In response to this rejection, claim 1 is amended in a way that is believed to clarify the use of the terms "coupler pin hole" and "bushing hole part". Withdrawal of the rejection is believed to be appropriate.

Original claims 1 and 5 were rejected as anticipated by Livesay, while claims 2 to 4 and 6 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 is amended to distinguish it over Livesay. Please note that, according to Livesay, a track bushing engaged with a sprocket is fixed with respect to a coupling pin, whereas according to the present invention, a track bushing is rotatable. Therefore, the technical idea of Livesay is completely different from that of the present invention.

More specifically, claim 1 as amended now recites that a rotatable bushing is interposed between the right and left internal links and is supported rotatably on the coupler pin. A coupler pin hole, a bushing hole, and a fixed bushing are also recited.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 5 is believed to be in order.

Original claims 8 and 9 were rejected as anticipated by Taft

Claims 8 and 9 are each amended to clarify that an external link and an internal link are interlinked alternately. In addition, the boss part is now referred to as having a raised portion, instead of a gentle slope upheaval. These recitations thus distinguish over Taft in that, in the claimed invention, a "parallel link" is adopted, resulting in an external link and an

internal link, as described. In Taft, there is no external and internal link because Taft's arrangement uses an "offset link" configuration.

Dated: November 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By
Ronald P. Kananen
Registration No.: 24,104
Attorney for Applicant

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC
Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

DC166217



ANOTATED SHEET

FIG. 7

